REMARKS

Claim 40

5   In the summary of the subject office action, the Examiner included claim 40 among the claims rejected, but in the detailed section of the office action, the Examiner did not provide any basis for the rejection. Accordingly, applicant assumes claim 40 was merely objected to for being dependent on rejected claims. If re-written in independent form, incorporating base and intervening limitations,

10   claim 40 would be allowable.

However, for reasons set forth below, the base and intervening claims are patentable, accordingly the rewriting is not necessary. Claim 40 is patentable in its dependent form.

15   ## Rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, 21 and 35

In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 21 and 35 under 35 USC 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1, as it is currently pending, recites as follows:
20   In a client system, an automated method for assisting a user of the client system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising:
retrieving and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having content, responsive to user direction; and
25   automatically assembling and *augmenting* the first *information page being browsed* with *one or more information source identifiers* identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally retrieved, *based at least in part on a portion of the content of said first information page*. (Emphasis added.)

30   Accordingly, claim 1 requires

- augmentation of *an information page being browsed*

- the augmentations are *information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally retrieved,* and that

- the augmentations are *based at least in part on a portion of the content of the information page being browsed.*

5   In rejecting claim 1, the examiner reasoned that Rubinstein in col. 15, lines 8-17, Fig. 8, Step 805, Fig. 9, Control Window, and Fig. 10 Contents View Window 1005, anticipated the first limitation of claim 1. Applicant agrees the request entered through control window 900, at step 805, results in an information page having a plurality of URLS identifying web pages that contain texts matching the request.

10   The result information page is formed from information pages returned from the search engines concurrently requested to analyze their web pages for contents matching the request of the user (col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53).

     The examiner further reasoned that Rubinstein in col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53, Fig. 8, step 815, Fig. 10 Contents View Window 1005, disclosed the second

15 limitation of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

     As alluded to earlier, in col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53, Rubinstein merely disclosed having a plurality of search engines to search their own web pages to identify web pages having contents that match the request, and return URLs of the matching web pages to form and display the *"answer" information page* for browsing

20 in Contents View Window 1005.

     The reference passages did not teach "generation of augmentation for an information page being browsed based on the content of the information page being browsed", as while the "searches" referred to in the reference passage are performed against information pages, they are not performed against an information

25 page retrieved and being browsed at the instruction of the user.

     The information page retrieved and being browsed at the instruction of the user is the "answer" information page (which comprises of URLs), and nothing in the

- 3 -

reference passages either teach or suggest such analyzing the content of the "answer" information page being browsed to generate the augmentation.

In fact, in col. 16, lines 7-13, Rubinstein clearly taught that the augmentation keyword phrases of the "answer" information page are generated by analyzing the

5   information pages pointed to by the URL content of the "answer" information page being browsed, and not the content of the "answer" information page itself.

Even if we are to ignore the foregoing, under Rubinstein, the information that augments the "answer" information page displayed in Content View Window are "keyword phrases" (see e.g. col. 16, line 9). They are not the required *"information*

10   *source identifiers identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally* retrieved".

The only other "information page" being browsed under Rubinstein is the "final" information page displayed in the Abstract window 1500. Under Rubinstein, browsing of the "final information page" is not augmented. More specifically, it is *not*

15   *augmented by information source identifiers identifying one or more information* *pages that may be additionally retrieved, where the information source identifiers* *are generated based at least in part on the "final" information page.*

Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly patentable over Rubinstein.

Claims 2 and 11 are dependent on claim 1, incorporating its limitations.

20   Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 2 and 11 are patentable over Rubinstein.

Claim 21 recites as follow:

21. In a server system, an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse

25   information, the method comprising:
                    receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third
                       party location by the client system a first information page to be
                       browsed on the client system, **presence ones of first keywords in**
                       the first information page, where presence ones of the first keywords

30   of the first information page are dynamically determined in real time by
                     the client system on retrieval of the first information page; and

- 4 -

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received presence ones of first keywords.

Accordingly, claim 21 is directed towards a method practiced on a server. The first limitation requires the server

- to receive from a client system a list of keywords the client dynamically determined in real time due to the keywords presence in an information page the client retrieved from a third party, and

- responds to the client by providing the client a list of information source identifiers.

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner reasoned that col 16, lines 7-13, Fig. 8, step 820) anticipated the first limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The reference passages disclosed the analysis of the web pages pointed to by the URL content of the result information page to produce a list of keywords. The analysis is performed by the client, and the results are displayed on the client.

First of all, the analysis is not performed on the result of information page being browsed, but on the web pages pointed to by the URL contents of the result information page being browsed. Further, there is nothing in the reference passages that teach or suggest the identified keywords to be provided to any server. Thus, the referenced passages do not anticipate the required limitation of a server receiving from a client, the keyword results produced by the client from analyzing an information page it retrieved from a third party.

Thus, it follows Rubinstein could not have any teachings or suggestions on a server responding to such receipt from a client system.

Thus, Claim 21 is patentable over Rubenstein.

Claim 35 recites as follows:

35. A client system comprising:
   a display; and
   a browser to facilitate augmented viewing of a first retrieved
      information page having contents, including an analyzer equipped
      to **dynamically assemble** a plurality of information source
      identifiers identifying a plurality of information pages that may be
      additionally retrieved, **based at least in part on a portion of said
      content of the first retrieved information page**.

Again claim 35 requires the client system to form the augmentation <u>based on</u>

<u>the content of the information page being viewed.</u>

As discussed earlier, Rubinstein fails to teach or suggest such limitation.

Therefore, claim 35 is patentable over Rubinstein.

Rejection of claims 30 and 31

. In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 30 and 31, under 35

USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215). Applicant

respectfully disagrees.

Claim 30 recites as follows:

30. In a server system, an automated method for facilitating provision of
assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse
information, the method comprising:
   receiving in real time from said client system, on retrieval from a third
      party location by the client system a first information page to be
      browsed on the client system, a locator of the first information page
      identifying the third party location; and
   in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information
      source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be
      additionally retrieved, **based at least in part on dynamically
      determined content of the first information page**.

Again, claim 30 requires the augmentation of the information page being

browsed be <u>based on the content of the information page being browsed</u>. Further,

claim 30 requires the manner in which the server becomes aware of the identity of

the information page being browsed (retrieved from a third party) is by the client

providing the locator of the information page (i.e. the third party) being browsed to the server.

In rejecting claim 30, the Examiner relies on Rubinstein's disclosure in col 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53 ...). As discussed earlier, the reference passages teach the concurrent provision of user entered criteria to a plurality of search engines, which in response, analyze their web pages for content matches, and return the URLs of the matching web pages. The client in turn forms the result information page being browsed based on the returned URLs.

Nothing in these passages teach the client notifying a server the identity/location of a third party from where it has retrieved an information page for browsing, and the server in response generates and provides augmentation *based on the content of the information page being browsed.*

The approach of generating augmentation based on the content of the information page being browsed is fundamentally different, and more efficient than the Rubinstein's approach of generating augmentation through concurrent analysis of the matching web pages identified by a plurality of search engines. The reason being search engines are capable of having knowledge of static web pages only. It is well known to those ordinarily skilled in the art that a much larger volume of the information available on the web are in databases used for generation of dynamic web pages. These dynamic web pages do not lend themselves to indexing by search engines, and accordingly not known to search engines. Therefore, their contents will not be part of the augmentation generated under Rubinstein. In contrast, the present invention is focused (on the information page actually retrieved and being browsed by the user), and accordingly, could also include information sourced from databases used to generate dynamic web pages.

Thus, claim 30 is patentable over Rubinstein.

Claim 31 depends on claim 30 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 31 is patentable over Rubinstein.

Rejection of claims 3-5, 9, 25, 26 and 31

In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 9, 25, 26 and 31 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215) and Davies et al (USP 6,353,827) combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 3-5, 9, and 31 are dependent on claims 1 and 30, incorporating their limitations. Since Davies does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 3-5, 9, and 31 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Davies.

Claim 25 contains similar limitation as claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the same reason, claim 25 is patentable over Rubinstein. Again, Davies does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 25 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Davies.

Claim 26 depends on claim 25 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 26 is patentable over Rubinstein.

Rejection of claims 6-8, 18, 22, 32, 35, 37 and 39

In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-8, 18, 22, 32, 35, 37 and 39 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215) and Grefensette et al (USP 6,446,035) combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 6-8, 22, and 32 are dependent on claims 1, 21 and 30, incorporating their limitations. Since Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 6-8, 22, and 32 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

- 8 -

Claim 18 contains similar limitations as claim 21, accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claim 18 is patentable over Rubinstein. Again, Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

Claims 35 and 39 also contain the requirement that the augmentation be provided based on the content of the information page being browsed. Accordingly, claims 35 and 39 are patentable over Rubinstein. Again, Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 39 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

Claim 37 is dependent on claim 35, incorporating its limitations. Since Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 37 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

Rejection of claims 12-17, 23-24, 28-29, and 33-34

In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-17, 23-24, 28-29, and 33-34 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215) and Finseth et al (USP 6,271,840) combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 12-14, 23-24, and 28-29 are dependent on claims 1, 21 and 25, incorporating their limitations. Since Finseth does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 12-14, 23-24 and 28-29, are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Finseth.

Claim 15 contains similar limitations as claim 35, accordingly, claim 15 is patentable over Rubinstein. Again, Finseth does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 15 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Finseth.

Claims 16-17 are dependent on claim 15, incorporating its limitations. Since Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 16-17 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

5   Claim 30 contains similar limitations as claim 35, accordingly, claim 30 is patentable over Rubinstein. Again, Finseth does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Finseth.

Claims 33-34 are dependent on claim 30, incorporating its limitations. Since 10 Grefensette does not remedy the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 33-34 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Grefensette.

Rejection of claims 10 and 27

15   In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 27 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al, Davies and Grefensette combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 10 and 27 are dependent on claims 1 and 25 respectively, incorporating their limitations. As discussed earlier, neither Davies nor Grefensette 20 remedies the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 10 and 27 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Davies and Grefensette.

Rejection of claims 19, 20, 38 and 42

25   In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 19-20, 38 and 42 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215) Grefensette and Finseth combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 19-20, 38 and 42 are dependent on claims 18, 35, and 39, incorporating their limitations. As discussed earlier, neither Grefensette nor Finseth remedies the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 19-20, 38 and 42 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with

5   Grefensette and Finseth.

Rejection of claims 36 and 41

In the subject office action, the Examiner rejected claims 36 and 41 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al, Davies and Gilmour (USP

10   6,377,949) combined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 36 and 41 are dependent on claims 35 and 39 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Since neither Davies nor Gilmour remedies the above identified deficiencies in teachings of Rubinstein, accordingly, claims 36 and 41 are patentable over Rubinstein, even when combined with Davies and Gilmour.

15

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

5   Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C.

10

JASON KLINGSWORTH Reg. 47,211
                    for
Date: <u>March 17, 2003</u>
15   Aloysius AuYeung
                                    Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center
20   1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900
     Portland, Oregon 97204
     Phone: (503) 222-9981
     FAX: (503) 796-2900

25